

F. VAN DER STOEP'S CONTRIBUTION TO DIDACTIC PEDAGOGICS: A PERSONAL ASSESSMENT*

W. J. Louw
University of Pretoria

In studying all related information about one person's contributions to a scientific discipline it is clear that the spirit and academic climate in which the contributions are made influence him in decisive ways. Further, the contributions made by co-workers and the enrichment for the development of thought provided by academic conversations also are matters that must be thoroughly taken into account. Tracing the development of an individual's thought can be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty from a thematic analysis of related publications.

However, publications are the result of thinking and do not necessarily illuminate the subtleties, the turns, the odd interpretations or the original insights that underlie the development of thinking or the ways in which the academic climate and academic conversations have influenced these acts of thinking. Because these matters remain hidden from us, the assessment that follows is partly limited to the evidence that can be derived from publications. Evidence from publications, however, must be supplemented with evidence expressed in the works of the academic's students. Prof. Van der Stoep's influence on the thinking of his students in research extends from 1961, when he was appointed lecturer in the Department of Historical and Didactic Pedagogics, to his retirement in 1989—a period of 28 years. During this period of time he guided a number of Master's and Doctoral students in their studies and research, some who were later appointed to academic positions and in their turn guided a number of post-graduate students. His broad circle of influence, also regarding the practice of teaching, is difficult to describe in an attempt of this nature and ought to be the theme of a thorough study.

* *Pedagogiekjoernaal*, 1989, Vol. 10, No. 2, 106-123.

A second limitation of an assessment of this nature stems from the time-space dimension. Simply not enough time has yet elapsed to make a purely objective and final assessment of Van der Stoep's contributions. In this regard, the Chinese notion of history and thus also the role of a person is sobering: all commentary about matters more recent than 2000 years is only journalistic! I got to know Van der Stoep when I was a student in 1965 and from 1968 as a colleague. In this almost quarter of a century I am able to view the growth of his academic thinking from a particular angle. This particular angle really implies a particular space, especially in the sense of academic space.

From the above it has to be concluded that this is my personal assessment of Van der Stoep's contribution to Didactic Pedagogics and cannot in any way claim completeness or even strict objectivity.

The academic and spiritual climate inherited by Van der Stoep is described in an excellent article by Mentz (1980: 86-100). He identifies three phases in the development of didactical-pedagogical thinking in the Faculty of Education and his classification is relevant here. The first phase extended from the establishment of the Department of Education in 1912, when it was located in the Faculty of Letters and Science, to 1937 when the Faculty of Education was established. The second phase extended from 1937 to the early 1960's, really to 1965, when Prof. F. van der Stoep was appointed head of the Department of Historical and Didactic Pedagogics. The third phase coincided with Van der Stoep's chairmanship of the department, that in the meantime had undergone various name changes, to the end of 1979 when from 1980 he was succeeded by W. J. Louw as head of the Department of Didactic Pedagogics and Subject Didactics. A fourth phase is added to Mentz's classification, namely, the period after 1980 when Van der Stoep was appointed as the first permanent full-time dean of the Faculty of Education.

This division is appropriate not only because it reflects the historical development of the Faculty of Education but because it also reflects the broad metabletical (historical) changes in European and Anglo-American thinking about Pedagogics, in general, and the thinking about Didactic Pedagogics in this faculty, in particular. Also, these divisions must not be viewed as watertight

compartments because changes in thinking occur gradually and elements of a particular view can be traced to a previous period and still can exercise an important influence in a succeeding period. On the other hand, there are particular scientific findings of a certain period that so grasp the essence of a matter that they form the point of departure and even the grounding of subsequent thinking. Frankl's image that he really stands on Freud's shoulders in order to be able to see what Freud has not seen perhaps clearly describes the dynamic of subsequent insights as well as developing academic thought.

During his initial student years at the University of Pretoria (1948-1951) Van der Stoep became thoroughly conversant with the residuals of the first phase and the beginning of the second. Thinking in Education during the first phase was characterized by what today would be viewed as a scientific-naturalistic interpretation of the nature of being human. Professors MacFadyen and J. C. Bosman carried this anthropological view of that time into Education via the available Anglo-American literature, and the focus of educational research (what today would be viewed as subject didactics) was strongly directed to schooling. The didactic interpretation of this scientific-naturalistic anthropology amounted to what later was called material forming. Material forming amounts to exposing the pupil to as much learning content as possible with the aim of its errorless reproduction as evidence of effective learning. Learning was viewed as that psychological process by which the learner forms concepts, perceives, remembers, thinks and knowingly applies what he has learned to related life situations. Learning as a psychological process was explained in terms of the physiological processes of the senses.

This emphasis on content for the sake of content (the **what** of teaching) had the consequence that little attention was given to the **how** (didactic forms and modalities). The how also was not viewed as an area worthy of scientific analysis and interpretation. Research on teaching was directed rather to content and historical-comparative studies grounded in empirical surveys and analyses especially were rampant. The contents of various school subjects in various countries were investigated and interpreted in order to create local syllabi.

When the didactic and subject didactic aspects of teaching were addressed this was rather casual and not the primary focus of scientific study. Examples of this are found in the works of J. J. N. Kruger (1932), I. M. Phipps (1933) and J. F. E. Havinga (1937). These authors suggest particular teaching methods, in general, and postulate didactic modalities for specific school subjects, in particular. The prescriptive nature of these postulates did not encourage penetrating studies of the didactic forms or even demand teleological interpretations of the didactic, as such, simply because the question of the scientific integrity of these pronouncements was not asked.

With his return from Holland, where he studied with the famous Ph. Kohnstamm, and especially after his appointment as head of the Department of Educational Psychology and Sociology in 1939, B. F. Nel ushered in a new turn in thinking about Education, in general, and Didactic Pedagogics, in particular, and thus began the second phase in the development of Didactic Pedagogic thought. As Mentz states, it was Nel's ideal "to extend to the faculty the Wurzburg School of the Psychology of Thought and its didactic application by the Amsterdam School of Kohnstamm" (loc. cit.: 88).

A turn in academic approach of this nature does not occur overnight. Since little literature was available on this new direction of thinking, and then only in Dutch and German, a new generation of academics had to be instructed in order to explicate further the new thinking before it could settle in properly. In this connection, Van der Stoep was exposed in his early academic forming to the views of material forming and to the first tentative didactic implications of the Wurzburg psychology of thought as interpreted by the Amsterdam school of Kohnstamm.

The Wurzburg psychology of thinking, as had been given form by Oswald Kulpe, was really a revolt or reaction against the naturalistic foundation of the psychology that was running rampant at the turn of the century. Kulpe and his co-workers had as their aim the study and possible explication of the higher mental processes of persons. From this research the following are some of the fundamental axioms derived that later would particularly influence thinking

about the Didactic: In thinking there are activities that essentially are imageless (in contrast to the association psychology of Locke and the presentation theory of Herbart); thinking is a conscious activity and it is a directed activity that is determined by the thinking task. Linking up with this the Cologne School developed the theory of layers of consciousness that differentiates among a concrete visual (individual images), a schematic (ideas) and an abstract (concepts) level of thinking.

The initial steps of the psychology of thinking and the theory of levels of consciousness can be viewed as corresponding to a new view of human being as a refined and more humane anthropology and was the point of departure for related research such as that of Otto Selz of Mannheim. Selz stressed the teleological (purposive) nature of thinking where related matters are interpreted via thinking in terms of aims and, further, that methods of solution can be mastered. Refining anthropological-pedagogical perceptions and the correlated pedagogical terminological design accelerated after World War II. This also provided the basis for the pedagogical interpretation and integration of the findings of existential philosophy and the phenomenological methodologists. According to Langeveld, "On the 'formative value' of subject matter" (1952: XIII), Kohnstamm was at the forefront of this development and as early as 1929 he had already expressed himself regarding Selz's psychology of thinking. As a student of Kohnstamm in the 1930's, Nel was thoroughly acquainted with his thinking about didactics and, in his turn, he acquainted his student Van der Stoep with this thinking. Van der Stoep identified himself early with Kohnstamm's view that the most important problem for Didactics is its scientific grounding. This problem would dominate his thinking for many years and only in 1972, with the appearance of "Didaskein", would he offer a provisional solution. But this is getting ahead of the development of his thinking.

During the 1950's Van der Stoep enrolled for the B. Ed. degree and completed the M. Ed. degree (both with honors) in 1960. In this period he made an intensive study of the "new" didactics of the Amsterdam School as interpreted by the Pretoria School under B. F. Nel's direction. He also took into account the research of fellow students, e.g., the work of A. J. Groenwald (1948) on object teaching

in nature studies, M. C. H. Sonnekus' (1955) research on the educational film as visual medium, Van Tonder's (1954) research on improved teaching methods for increasing achievement in Mathematics, P. A. Duminy's (1958) related research on improving methods of teaching in History, A. P. Cronje's (1960) research on improving work methods in Arithmetic and A. A. van der Merwe's (1958) research on the didactic significance of the discussion lesson in teaching the Physical Sciences. This focus was partly a response to the school's task of developing technology and mass-communication media (in response to the knowledge explosion) after World War II, to interpret it in terms of curriculum and then integrate it into the school system. In part, this also was a response to the logical-causal imperative to harmonize teaching with the forms and processes of learning. In this process, as far as its aims and functions are concerned, the school was re-defined and re-structured: it was the task of the school to form the child to an independent, responsible personality; the school must form the child as a totality; the school must educate the child in terms of the normative-ethical demands of the community; to the degree that a child acknowledges authority, to that extent the school gives him more freedom that is expressed in more self activity with the consequence that the class organization must be changed and supplemented with other individually directed forms of teaching; relevance as a didactic principle must be found in the curriculum and learning content must be directed to insight rather than ready knowledge; recognition must be given in school to the idea that by the choice of relevant content, the design of functional didactic procedures, and, didactic designs in the school must reflect the research findings of "Pedagogics" (Child psychology, Sociopedagogics, didactics, etc.).

The research during this period made a tremendous contribution to the regeneration of the school but did not address the problem of the grounding of the Didactic, as such. The reason for this clearly is that the responsibility for the didactic was in psychology and particularly in the psychology of thought; that is, didactic principles were viewed as consequences of psychological principles. A study of Kohnstamm's didactic conclusions (Kohnstamm, 1952) suggests that he did not attribute the ability or task to the Didactic to disclose its own structures but viewed it as a science for designing functional

structures for teaching practice based on the psychology of thinking; in other words, Didactics applies the findings of the psychology of thinking to its designs for practice.

In his research for his Ed. D. dissertation, published in 1965 by HAUM under the title “Taalanalyse en taalevaluering as Pedagogies-Didactiese Diagnostiseringsmetode” (Language analysis and evaluation as a Pedagogic-Didactic method of diagnosis), Van der Stoep gave evidence that he had thoroughly ascertained the opinions of various schools of thought regarding language, learning and teaching. Since this study primarily addressed the orthopedagogic and orthodidactic task of diagnosis it is obvious that he had to thoroughly orient himself with respect to the essences of a child’s lived-experiencing and experiencing of his situatedness and his attribution of meaning to it. In addition, with his clear phenomenological attunement it was necessary for Van der Stoep to venture with caution in illuminating the meaning and structure of the pedagogic situation otherwise the child’s lived-experiencing, experiencing and attributing meaning to it cannot be understood because without clarity about this “problematica perennis” in the Pedagogic, no accountable scientific grounding is possible. The guidance he received from his teachers B. F. Nel and C. K. Oberholzer, and as far as the latter is concerned, his guiding and forming in systematic logic and introduction to ontology, was of decisive significance for Van der Stoep in his analysis of the pedagogic situation and especially the nature of the relationships in it. In his analysis of the relationships in the pedagogic situation Van der Stoep clearly realized that the prevailing interpretations of the structure and meaning of the situation and the nuances given to these interpretations are derived directly from the [philosophical] anthropological conceptions and perceptions of the various pedagogicians.

The refinement of this facet for interpreting the meaning and structure of the relationships in the pedagogic situation, that later became the point of departure for his didactic theory allowed him to thoroughly acquaint himself with the foremost thinkers and especially the leading German thinkers in this area. For example, he acquainted himself with the Christian personalism of Kohnstamm (1929), the phenomenological-anthropological views of Langeveld

(1961), the dialogical personalism of Buber (1968) and the existentialist-pedagogical personalism of Bollnow (1959). Van der Stoep's thorough philosophical-anthropological forming and preparation also made him receptive to Langeveld's (1961) phenomenological analyses of the pedagogic situation and his pronouncement that "situation" is the fundamental category of pedagogical theory (as well as the foundation of the Didactic). Klafki's (1955) first pronouncement about the adult's initiative (as imperative) for establishing a pedagogic relationship in the pedagogic situation and the meaning of content (norms, values, customs, etc.) in realizing the pedagogic relationships such as described by Ballauf (1966) were important points of departure for Van der Stoep's later grounding of the Didactic.

With his appointment as head of the Department of Historical and Didactic Pedagogics in 1965 (the beginning of the third phase in the development of thinking about didactics according to Mentz), Van der Stoep already was thoroughly formed in didactic Pedagogics, Pedagogics, philosophical anthropology, phenomenology and the practice of teaching. This background is expressed clearly in his inaugural address "Konstituering in teoretiese-didaktiese perspektief" [Constituting in theoretical-didactic perspective] (1966). In this work he gives a clear indication that he no longer can accept a "didactics ensnared in the grip of traditionalism" (Mentz, op cit.: 92) and he assigns himself the task of founding in a scientific way the Didactic as a pedagogical discipline and, where possible, to regenerate practice. This resolve is expressed further in a 1968 article published in the journal **Paedagogische Studien** with the title "Probleme rondom 'n fundering van die didaktiek" [Problems regarding the grounding of the didactic]. In this work he also sought to link up with the fundamental questions in Philosophy, especially regarding the ontological-anthropological moments of the person-world relationship. The line of thought identified in this connection is expressed in the conclusion that ontology permeates the anthropological and, from there, the pedagogical and, finally, the didactic. During this period there were a variety of didactic matters that claimed his attention, e.g., the learning assignment as a task for the teacher, learning material as a problematic matter for didactics, didactic foundations of modern teaching, a pedagogical explanation of the didactic, etc. At the same time Van der Stoep

prepared himself for his sabbatical leave that he spent in Heidelberg, Germany. In this preparation he applied himself to the theories of forming written by German Didacticians and in this regard he acquainted himself with the thinking of Nohl (1949), Weniger, Spranger (1949), Litt (1961), Derbolav (1960), Klafki (1964), etc.

With the appearance of Klafki's work "Das Paedagogische Problem des Elementaren und die Theorie der kategorialen Bildung" [The Pedagogical Problem of the Elementals and the Theory of Categorical Forming] in 1959, and especially his revised and expanded edition of 1964, the didactic polemic between formal and material forming finally was neutralized. The meaning of the concept "forming" that, on the one hand, refers to an inner change as a result of the formative value and quality of the content (this is the unlocking task of the adult) and, on the other hand, to the quality of change that is expressed in a more responsible and accountable relationship with reality (the child's readiness to unlock himself—encounter is a precondition) are the central moments in Klafki's view of categorical forming that are actualized by means of this double unlocking. Klafki's explanation of "categorical" in categorical forming involves the didactic meaning of exemplary teaching and learning, an aspect of the theory to which Scheuerl, Wagenschein, Derbolav and others had given attention. During his stay in Germany, Van der Stoep not only penetratingly studied these aspects of didactic theory but during personal discussions with the academicians mentioned and others he identified as the central remaining problem the limitations of their theoretical pronouncements for scientifically grounding the Didactic. The reason for this is that although the problems regarding theories of forming were neutralized and had decisive significance for didactic theory building, the whole of the didactic event and structures still were not addressed.

It takes academic courage and conviction to doubt the principles of the theory of categorical forming as a grounding of the Didactic because the unlocking of content with formative value directed to meaning and quality and the child's correlated readiness to open himself to the meaning of the content result in change that amounts to an improved (more accountable and responsible) relationship of

the child to the relevant reality. It is clear that this evidence is so convincing that proposing the theory of categorical forming as a grounding of the didactic can make a claim to legitimacy.

Even so, the theory of categorical forming, as structure, and exemplary teaching, as dynamic, still do not make pronouncements about content and the learning psychological moments that elucidate the relation between child and learning material – they illuminate neither the **how** of the dynamics in the adult-child's activities nor **how** the teaching ought to occur in order to reach the state of being formed. The interpretation of exemplary teaching as a way of bringing about the categories (meaning) of the content suggests, to a degree, a possible “how”. Are there others?

To be able to address this question in any sense Van der Stoep turned himself to the original experience of teaching and from the first ontological category of “being-in-the-world” he reasoned about the matter in phenomenologically consistent ways. In this task the works of F. J. J. Buytendijk (no date), E. Fink (1960), H. Hetzer (no date), L. Kaufmann (1965), P. Moor (1962), A. Russel (1965), H. Scheuerl (1954) and G. Von Kujawa (1949) provided him with an important perspective on child play and on its anthropological significance. The works of R. Bang (1968), H. Fischer (1965) and O. Haase (1953) also offered him valuable insights into conversation in a didactic context. With his return from Germany, Van der Stoep in 1968 published his response to the question asked above in the book “Didaktiese Grondvorme” [Didactic Ground-forms]. This contribution to didactic theory building and the grounding of didactic theory is Van der Stoep's most important publication of the first period of his academic thinking and became the point of departure for a great number of research projects of colleagues and students. As an example of this influence the research of C. J. van Dyk is mentioned that in 1969 resulted in his D. Ed. dissertation titled “Vanaf vorming (Bildung) tot eksemplariese onderrig en leer: ‘n didakties-pedagogiese strukturering” [From forming to exemplary teaching and learning: a didactic-pedagogic structuring] as well as the work of S. J. Gous in the same year titled “Verantwoording van die Didakties-Pedagogiese” [Justifying the Didactic Pedagogic].

The most important finding of “Didaktiese Grondvorme” is that in original experience a person’s relationship to reality shows a harmony between his forms of living and his lifeworld. Forms of living are those repeated activity structures that a person engages in to address the demands of his lifeworld; thus, forms of living are differentiated according to the nature of the demands of the lifeworld. Forms of living are not purely mechanistic reactions to these demands but are principal ways of giving meaning to the lifeworld. The harmony between life form and lifeworld is, according to its nature, directed to giving sense and meaning and thus to purposive experience, and forms of living eventually are formalized into everyday and familiar forms. From his analyses it was clear to Van der Stoep that all life forms have didactic significance either as teaching content or as didactic ground-forms: as for the latter, those life forms that support teaching and learning, i.e., that have significance for teaching, qualify as didactic ground-forms. From all of the forms of living Van der Stoep postulated play, conversation, example and assignment as didactic ground-forms and the rest are considered to be teaching content. These didactic ground-forms provide the context of the teaching activities and have important implications for designing teaching methods in formal teaching situations.

In addition to elucidating the didactic ground-forms and their function in overcoming the separation between person and world (child and content), fundamental-didactic thinking still had to address the problem of integrating all of the related pedagogic and didactic data into a pedagogic-didactic theory and to ground the theory. Van der Stoep assumed this latter task and in 1972 the fruits of his thinking were published under the title “Didaskein” [Didactics]. Irrespective of Van der Stoep’s deliberations on a scientifically accountable point of departure for didactic theory building, the time-concrete imperative as an aspect of the problem of teaching/learning and the dictates of other pedagogic perspectives on “didaskein”, in this work he also gives attention to the categorical structure of teaching and he interprets pronouncements about the original experiencing, lived-experiencing and learning didactically-pedagogically. He closes this work with a didactic analysis of the category “unlocking reality” and gives a

preliminary interpretation of the origin as well as the form and content aspects of the lesson structure.

What perhaps is of greater importance in this work is Van der Stoep's conviction that thinking about didactics essentially is pedagogical thinking, i.e., didactic theory building must show and provide evidence of how the pedagogic is actualized within the didactic because the pedagogic is actualized only in terms of the didactic while the meaning of the didactic is in the pedagogic. The line of thinking followed here is from ontological anthropology, through the pedagogic, to the didactic, a line that is necessarily phenomenologically as well as personalogically-ethically accountable.

"Didaskein" not only made an important contribution to pedagogic-didactic theory building but especially to the grounding and even point of departure for comprehensive research projects, often diverse in nature. An example is the research by W. J. Louw for the D. Ed. degree in 1972 with the title "An evaluation of the responsibility of the university regarding the training of secondary school teachers" and his later work (1973) "Die skool as sosiale instelling" [The school as a social institution] and in (1975) "n Verkenning van die snyvlak tussen die didaktiese en sosiopedagogiek" [An exploration of the interface between the didactic and sociopedagogic].

With the appearance of "Didaskein" the second phase in the development of Van der Stoep's didactic-pedagogic thinking closed and the academic task that followed was to design practice from overarching functional Didactic-Pedagogic structures. This shift in focus represents the third phase in the development of Van der Stoep's thought: increasingly the consequences of an accountable didactical-pedagogical theory for practice occupied his attention and this influenced the research of his co-workers and students.

The first task then was to further refine the initial pronouncements about the passage from didactic-pedagogic theory to teaching practice that was addressed in the last part of "Didaskein". In this work Van der Stoep was assisted by C. J. van Dyk, A. Swart and W. J. Louw and in 1973 "Die Lesstruktuur" [The Lesson Structure] was

published. In this work the theoretical pronouncements about Didactic Pedagogics are interpreted and integrated into a general didactic structure that provides a blueprint for designing particular lesson situations, especially for subject didactics but also for orthodidactics. The systematization of didactic-pedagogic theoretical pronouncements in “Die Lesstructuur” first focuses on describing the essences of the lesson structure, its origin and the necessity of accounting for a teaching aim. The second part deals with the lesson form and the connections among fundamental didactic forms, teaching methods, the methodological principles of the inductive and deductive approaches and the forms of ordering the learning material. The third part illuminates the didactic modalities in terms of the methods and functions of teaching and learning aids (teaching media). The work is closed with an exposition of preparing a lesson accountably as well as with several examples of lessons.

An analysis of the publications of lecturers and students in the department after the appearance of “Die Lesstructuur” testifies to exceptional academic achievements among which are the scientific rigor with which relevant problems in subject didactics, orthodidactics, curriculum studies and tertiary teaching are approached and the scientific quality of this research. “Die Lesstructuur” not only gave clarity and direction to the course and nature of research in the Department of Didactics but also provided a point of departure for related research in other departments in the Faculty of Education. In this connection, the work of [the psychopedagogician] M. C. H. Sonnekus (1975) “Onderwyser, Les en Kind” [The Teacher, the Lesson and the Child] is mentioned in which an original further interpretation is given of the two matters of “teaching” and “learning”. The work of W. A. Landman (1977) “Fundamentele Pedagogiek en Onderwyspraktiek” [Fundamental Pedagogics and Teaching Practice] represents a fundamental pedagogical interpretation of the lesson structure that also strongly influenced his later fundamental pedagogical pronouncements about giving a lesson and about the curriculum.

Irrespective of Van der Stoep’s thorough involvement with the problem of the grounding of Didactic Pedagogics, from 1961 he was intensively involved in teacher preparation. In this regard, he

realized early that the absence of a textbook for teachers of Didactic Pedagogics that reflects the new directions of thinking in Pedagogics and Didactic Pedagogics not only represents a deficiency in training teachers but also can restrain the development and renewal of teaching in the Republic of South Africa. In 1968 he published, with his brother, Dr. O. A. van der Stoep (Head of the Lynwood Primary School) “Didaktiese Oriëntasie” [Didactic Orientation] to fill this gap. This work quickly had an important place in the training of teachers and was adopted by most Afrikaans [speaking] universities and teacher training colleges. In this way Van der Stoep solidified his position as one of the foremost didacticists in the country, not only as a theoretician but also as a practitioner. In 1973 the book was translated into English and published under the title “Didactic Orientation” to also satisfy the need of English speaking teachers for a comprehensive and scientifically contemporary work in Didactic Pedagogics.

The turn and renewal in thinking about didactic pedagogics ushered in after the appearance of “Didaktiese Grondvorme” (1969), “Didaskein” (1972) and “Die Lesstruktuur” (1973) gave rise to a re-evaluation of “Didactic Orientation”. Further, as one looks at the scope and nature of the publications appearing in the late 60’s and early 70’s in the Faculty of Education it is obvious that new insights and perspectives in other academic departments had particular relevance for Didactic Pedagogics and especially had important curriculum implications for teacher training. These insights and perspectives first had to be interpreted didactically before they could be integrated into the theoretical scheme of Didactic Pedagogics and before their functional possibilities for teaching could be clarified. In order to address this matter “Didactic Orientation” was replaced in 1976 by Van der Stoep and Louw with the publication “Inleiding tot die didaktiese pedagogiek” [Introduction to Didactic Pedagogics] and in 1984 “Didactic Orientation” was replaced by the work “Didactics” [in English] by the same authors.

It was especially “Inleiding tot die didaktiese pedagogiek” that had received wide attention. Irrespective of several printings a third revised edition was published in 1984—this edition is now (1989) in its second printing. Certain themes from the first printing were

retained but radically revised while the third edition was expanded to include chapters on the curriculum and on non-formal teaching. The latter chapter on non-formal teaching really reflects the last phase of the development of Van der Stoep's thought and will be treated more comprehensively below. In a certain respect "Inleiding tot die didaktiese pedagogiek" represents an important facet of Van der Stoep's influence on thinking in Didactic Pedagogics and in the practice of teaching as such: an entire generation of Afrikaans speaking student teachers at most universities and teachers colleges were exposed via this work to the most contemporary didactic-pedagogic insights. The impact of "Didactics" perhaps was not as wide but the fact that this work was intensively studied at several Black universities and teachers colleges presumes a certain influence on Black teacher's thinking about Didactic Pedagogics as well as on a re-evaluation of their teaching practice. One of the first signs of this influence is the increasing number of Black teachers who enrolled in graduate training in the Faculty of Education. This also stresses that Van der Stoep's contributions to and influences on academics and the science of teaching are not limited to a certain linguistic and cultural group.

In 1977 Van der Stoep published with C. J. van Dyk "Inleiding tot die vakdidaktiek" [Introduction to Subject Didactics] in which the grounding of Didactic Pedagogics as an overarching structure is drawn out in systematic ways after particularizing and nuancing these structures for subject didactics, but where Subject Didactics as a Pedagogic discipline is founded and described for the first time. With this work Van der Stoep completed a line of thinking that is described as ontological-anthropological-pedagogical-didactical-subject didactical.

From his appointment as permanent full-time Dean of the Faculty of Education in January 1980 he was increasingly occupied with national teaching activities. In this connection, for example, he assumed a leading role in the Human Sciences Research Council's "Research on teaching in the Republic of South Africa" that in 1981 resulted in the familiar De Lange Report. His contribution regarding the task of curriculum for the future and his insights about the integration of various teaching systems and forms into the total teacher supply for the Republic of South Africa resulted in the

Government's White Paper on teaching policy in connection with the De Lange Report. Van der Stoep's exposure to and involvement in the national problem of teaching provided him with an academic platform from which he, in direct ways, participated in teaching policy. In this connection, e.g., he served for a time on the Scientific Advisory Board to the Prime Minister.

This exposure to the hard reality of, e.g., the demographic trends in the R. S. A. and the demands that this placed on the teacher supply and system forced him to direct his academic focus to relevant problems. For him it was quickly evident that the existing formal teaching system simply could not fulfill the contemporary or future teaching needs and that other forms of teaching, supplemented by the existing system, would have to be integrated. It is for this reason that during the academic year 1982/1983 he spent his sabbatical leave in Klagenfurt, Austria, intensively studying the nature and essence of non-formal teaching. In addition to various articles resulting from this work, in 1984 he published his insights in the book "Non-Formal Education" [in English]. In all respects this study is viewed as of cardinal importance and in 1984 the Human Sciences Research Council assigned a research unit to him for studying all aspects regarding the problem of non-formal teaching. Under Van der Stoep's leadership, and with funds from the research unit, to date non-formal teaching has involved 33 projects. From these reports 7 were a basis for M.Ed. theses and 4 Ph.D. dissertations. When the unit will end in 1990 a total of 50 projects will have been involved and an additional number of master's and doctoral degrees will have been awarded. In itself this work represents a significant and great contribution to teaching in the R.S.A.

Van der Stoep has been honored many times for his contribution to Pedagogics and teaching: in 1981 he was honored by the South African Academy of Science and Arts and in 1982 he received an honorary medal from the South African Association for the Advancement of Education. Van der Stoep's contributions to Pedagogics, in general, and didactic Pedagogics, Subject Didactics and Non-Formal Education, in particular, really are found in the academic forming of his students and the inspiration he provided to

his colleagues. His example of academic excellence will be followed by his students and colleagues in future generations.

AUTHOR'S ENGLISH SUMMARY (Edited slightly)

In this article the various intellectual and academic perceptions and conceptions that influenced Van der Stoep's academic thinking are taken as the point of departure because they provide a convenient chronological framework to understand and assess Van der Stoep's contribution. Van der Stoep was exposed to the scientific-naturalistic thinking current during the early years of the Department of Education (1916) and later (1937) the Faculty of Education because these ideas were partly incorporated into the teacher training program he followed. In the course of his post-graduate studies, Van der Stoep became well versed in the approach of the Kohnstamm Amsterdam School and the interpretations of the Wurzburg school – both introduced by B. F. Nel.

During the late fifties and early sixties, Van der Stoep immersed himself in contemporary pedagogical thinking and methodological constructs, providing him with the essentials to overcome traditionalism and to devise a sound theoretical basis for his own academic thought. His major concern was to ground didactics in terms of the first ontological category of "Dasein" [being-in-the-world] and the structure that emerged illustrates that his close thinking follows an ontological-anthropological-pedagogical-didactical line. Various publications describing the interrelationships and cohesions of difficult theoretical didactical problems were the result of his endeavor and are described in this article.

Apart from his contribution to basic academic thought, Van der Stoep's contribution to national educational research projects, and in the later years of his tenure as dean, his contribution to non-formal education, are described. The article concludes with a brief overview of Van der Stoep's influence on post-graduate students in an attempt to arrive at a balanced assessment of his contribution to Didactic Pedagogics.

References

- Ballauf, T. H. (1962): **Die paedagogische Unzulaenglichkeit Biologischer Anthropologie**. Essen.
- Bang, R. (1968): **Das gezielte Gespraech**. Munich: Reinhart.
- Bollnow, O. F. (1959): **Existenzphilosophie und Paedagogik**. Stuttgart.
- Buber, M. (1962): **Das dialogische Prinzip**. Heidelberg.
- Buytendijk, F. J. J. (no date): **Het spel van mens en dier**. Amsterdam: "Kosmos".
- Cronje, A. P. (1960): **'n Psigologiese foute-analyse in rekene veral ten opsigte van breuke vir St V-leerlinge aan die laerskool met spesiale verwysing na heelkundige didaktiek**. Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of Pretoria.
- Fink, E. (1960): **Spiel als Weltzymbol**. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Fisher, H. (1955): **Das freie Unterrichtsgespraech**. Brunswieg: Georg Westermann.
- Gous, S. J. (1969): **Verantwoording van die Didaktiese-pedagogiese**. Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of Pretoria.
- Groenwald, A. J. (1946): **Die sielkundige grondslag en praktiese toepassing van aanskouingsonderwys met spesiale verwysing na die onderwys van Natuurstudie**. Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of Pretoria.
- Haase, O. (1953): **Uber die Gespraech**. Beitrage: Westermann.
- Havinga, J. F. E. (1937): **Die onderwys van Geskiedenis in die Middlebare skool**. Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Hetzer, H. (no date): **Das Spiel in der Schule**. Frankfurt: Atlantik Paul List.
- Human Sciences Research Council. Report (1981): **Teaching in the RSA**. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Kaufmann, L. ((1965): Formen und Losen-Einige Aspekte zur Bedeutung des Spiels. **Schule und Psigologie**, No. 9.
- Kohnstamm, Ph. (1929): **Persoonlijkheid in Wording**. Haarlem.
- Kohnstamm, Ph. (1952): **Keur uit het Didactisch Werk van Ph. Kohnstamm**. Groningen: J. B. Wolters.
- Klafki, W. (1955): **Das Paedagogische Problem. Studien zur Bildungstheorie und Didaktik**. Weinheim.
- Klafki, W. (1964): **Das Paedagogische Problem des Elementaren und die Theorie der Kategorialen Bildung**. Weinheim: Julius Betz.
- Kruger, J. J. N. (1932): **Die Onderwys van Omgewingsaardryks-kunde**. Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Landman, W. A. (1977): **Fundamentele Pedagogiek en Onderwyspraktyk**. Durban: Butterworth. **English translation** (partial): <http://www.georgeyonge.net>
- Langeveld, M. J. (1952): Kohnstamm. Een korte schets van zijn leven en ontwikkelingsgang. In **Keur uit het didactisch werk van Ph. Kohnstamm**. Groningen: J. B. Wolters.
- Langeveld, M. J. (1961): **Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek**. Groningen: J. B. Wolters.
- Louw, W. J. (1972): An evaluation of the responsibility of the university regarding the training of secondary school teachers. **Pedagogiekstudie**, No. 70, University of Pretoria.
- Louw, W. J. (1973): Die skool as sosiale instelling. **Pedagogisch Forum**, Vol. 9.
- Louw, W. J. (1975): 'n Verkenning van die snyvlak tussen die didaktiese en sociopedagogiek. **S. A. Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek**, Vol. 9, No. 1.
- Mentz, H. C. (1980): (History of) Didaktiese Pedagogiek. **Pedagogiekjoernaal**, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Jubilee Issue). **English translation**: <http://www.georgeyonge.net>
- Moor, P. (1962): **Die Bedeutung des Spiels in der Erziehung**. Bern: Hans Huber.
- Phipps, I. M. (1933): **Visual Education**. Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of Pretoria.
- Russel, A. (1965): **Das Kinderspiel**. Munich: C. H. Beek.
- Scheuerl, H. (1954): **Das Spiel**. Weinheim: Julius Beltz.
- Sonnekus, M. C. H. (1955): 'n Ondersoek na die gebruik van enkele tegnieke van die

- opvoedkundige film as aanskouings-material. **Opvoedkundige Studies**, No. 12, University of Pretoria.
- Sonnekus, M. C. H. (1975): **Onderwyser, Les en Kind**. Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.
- Van der Merwe, A. A. (1958): **Die betekenis van die leergesprek as 'n metode ter verbetering van die leerprestasie van St IX-leerlinge ten opsigte van Natuurkunde**. Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Van der Stoep, F. (1965): Probleme rondom 'n fundering van die didaktiek. **Paedagogische Studien**, No. 11.
- Van der Stoep, F. (1965): **Taalanalise en taalevaluering as Pedagogies-Didaktiese Diagnostiseringsmetode**. Pretoria: HAUM.
- Van der Stoep, F. (1966): Konstituering in teoreties-didaktiese perspektief. **Publication of the University of Pretoria**, No. 30.
- Van der Stoep, F. and Van der Stoep, O. A. (1968): **Didaktiese Orientasie**. Pretoria: Academica.
- Van der Stoep, F. (1969): **Didaktiese Grondvorme**. Pretoria: Academica.
- Van der Stoep, F. (1972): **Didaskein**. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill.
- Van der Stoep, F. and Van der Stoep, O. A. ((1973): **Didactic Orientation**. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill.
- Van der Stoep, F., Van Dyk, C. J., Louw, W.J. Swart, A. (1973): **Die Lesstruktuur**. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill. **English translation:** <http://www.georgeyonge.net>
- Van der Stoep, F. and Louw, W. J. (1976): **Inleiding tot die didaktiese pedagogiek**. Pretoria: Academica. (First Edition, 1976, Third Revised Edition, 1984). **English translation:** <http://www.georgeyonge.net>
- Van der Stoep, F. and Van Dyk, C. J. (1977): **Inleiding tot die Vakdidaktieke**. Johannesburg: Perskor.
- Van der Stoep, F. and Louw, W. J. (1984): **Didactics**. Pretoria: Academica.
- Van der Stoep, F. (1984): **Non-formal Education**. Pretoria: Codex.
- Van Dyk, C. J. (1969): **Vanaf vorming (Bildung) tot eksemplariese onderrig en leer: 'n didakties-pedagogiese structuring**. Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of Pretoria.
- Von Kujawa, G. (1949): **Ursprung des Spiels**. Cologne: E. A. Seeman.
- Van Tonder, J. C. (1954): Die invloed van verbeterde leer metodes op die denkprestasies van St. VIII-leerlings in Wiskunde. **Opvoedkundige Studies**, No. 6, University of Pretoria.